



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,852	12/28/2001	Tommy K. Eng	21192-06625	4831

758                  7590                  08/22/2003

FENWICK & WEST LLP  
SILICON VALLEY CENTER  
801 CALIFORNIA STREET  
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER
----------

DO, THUAN V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2825

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/040,852	ENG, TOMMY K.	
	Examiner Thuan Do	Art Unit 2825	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2003.
  - 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
  - 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
- Disposition of Claims**
- 4) Claim(s) 3-37 is/are pending in the application.
    - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
  - 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
  - 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
  - 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
  - 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 3-37 are responsive to the preliminary amendment entered 07/29/2003.

Claims 1,2 have been canceled from restriction selection.

### ***Claim objections***

Claim 1, the term "...passing optimized design information...",

Claim 35, the term "...passed to gate-level implementation tools...",

are unclear to what applicant intend to mean within specification. Clarification or correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claim 3-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Dangelo, Pat. No. 6,216,252.

**Regarding claim 3:** Dangelo teaches a method comprising :

optimizing a network of logic building blocks logically and physically using placement based information to create an accurate model of the electronic design (col. 8, lines 41-53 using placement modules, col. 9, lines 1-8 with optimizing gate blocks of ASIC and figure 4) ; and

passing optimized design information associated with the accurate model to gate-level implementation tools to achieve predictable results at gate-level implementation of the electronic design (col. 8, lines 41-53, col. 9, lines 1-8, figure 4 and col. 3, lines 3-21 using predicate logic in implementing electronic design).

Art Unit: 2825

**Regarding claims 4-13:** These claims teach well known methods to support claim 3 and rejected in the similar manner.

**Regarding claim 14:** Dangelo teaches a method comprising:  
creating a virtual prototype to model the electronic design thereby enabling design optimization (col. 3, lines 58-67) before detail physical implementation (col. 6, lines 41-55 using frequent simulation of the circuit being designed in small parts before it is simulated as a whole) ; and

deriving a solution for design convergence based on data resulting from the design optimization (col. 4, lines 57-62).

**Regarding claim 15:** This claim teaches a well known method to support claim 14 and rejected in the similar manner.

**Regarding claim 16:** Dangelo teaches a method comprising:  
mapping (col. 7, lines 63-67) the model into logic building blocks thereby creating a network of logic building blocks, a number of the logic building blocks having a logic structure including a plurality of gates thereby providing a higher level of abstraction than gates (col. 8, lines 41-53, col. 9, lines 1-8, figure 4) ; and

optimizing the network of logic building blocks, each logic building block having performance data based on placed and routed implementations of that logic building block (col. 8, lines 41-53, col. 9, lines 1-8, figure 4).

**Regarding claims 17-30:** These claims teach well known methods to support claim 16 and rejected in the similar manner.

**Regarding claim 31:** Dangelo teaches a method with:  
clustering multiple logical building blocks into partitions thereby yielding a partition level abstraction of the electronic design (col. 9, lines 1-8 and col. 4, lines 10-20) ;

creating a model for each partition (col. 4, lines 10-20); and

optimizing additional levels (col. 3, lines 43-55) of the electronic design using the partition models thereby enabling hierarchical optimization without reanalyzing partition level details (col. 3, lines 58-67 where Dangelo is silent about reanalyzing partition level details) .

**Regarding claim 32:** Dangelo teaches a method comprising:

creating physical implementations of a logic building block, the logic building block having a logic structure including a plurality of gates thereby providing a higher level of abstraction than gates (col. 6, lines 41-55 using frequent simulation of the circuit being designed in small parts before it is simulated as a whole) ; and

monitoring (col. 1, lines 61-67) area and performance data of each physical implementation based on a number of selected input parameter sets (col. 3, lines 48-55).

**Regarding claims 33,34:** These claims teach well known methods to support claim 32 and rejected in the similar manner.

**Regarding claim 35:** Dangelo teaches a computer program comprising:

a library of logic structures (col. 12, lines 40-55), each logic structure having performance data based on placed and routed implementations of that logic building structure (col. 11, lines 44-55), the performance data being organized according to characteristics of the implementations (col. 4, lines 49-55) ; and

a plurality of modules for optimizing a network of a number of the logic structures using placement based information to create an accurate model of the electronic design thereby enabling optimized design information (col. 3, lines 58-67) associated with the accurate model to be passed to gate-level implementation tools to achieve predictable results at gate-level implementation of the electronic design (col. 8, lines 41-53, col. 9, lines 1-8, figure 4 and col. 3, lines 3-21 using predicate logic in implementing electronic design).

**Regarding claims 36,37:** These claims teach well known programs to support claim 35 and rejected in the similar manner.

## CONTACT INFORMATION


3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuan Do whose telephone number is 703-305-2362.

Art Unit: 2825

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30 (except 2nd Fridays).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew S. Smith can be reached on 703-308-1323. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703305-3431 for regular communications and 703-305-3431 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0596.



Thuan Do  
Patent examiner  
8/13/03